

REMARKS

Claims 1-49 are pending, with claims 1, 6, 12, 18, 23, 27, 33 and 42 being independent. Claims 50-55 have been canceled and claims 1, 6, 12, 18, 23, 27, 33, 35, 42 and 48 have been amended.

The specification has been amended to correct minor defects and to overcome the informality objection. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-17 and 23-26 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Sakaguchi in view of Fujita.

As amended, independent claim 1 recites a light emitting device that includes a substrate, an EL element formed over the substrate, a barrier film covering the EL element, an absorption film formed on the barrier film, and a passivation film formed on the absorption film. With respect to claim 1 and the claims depending from claim 1, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because neither Sakaguchi, Fujita, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests a barrier film on which is formed an absorption film on which is formed a passivation film, as recited in claim 1.

Sakaguchi describes an EL element that is covered by an insulative protecting layer 8 that is surrounded by an inert liquid 12 contained within a metal or glass sealing member 9. See Sakaguchi at Fig. 1 and col. 2, line 35 to col. 3, line 15. Thus, while Sakaguchi's protecting layer 8 arguably could be equated to the barrier film recited in claim 1, Sakaguchi nowhere

describes a barrier film on which is formed an absorption film and passivation film. Moreover, while Sakaguchi describes a dehydrating agent and an oxygen absorber, these materials are not included as part of an absorption film. Rather, they are included as part of the inert liquid 12. See Sakaguchi at col. 3, lines 9-15.

Similarly, Fujita describes an organic EL device 10 that is present in a space formed by the concave portion of a housing material 18 fixed onto a glass substrate 11. The remainder of the space is filled with an inert liquid layer 20 that then surrounds the organic EL device. See Fujita at col. 17, lines 4-26. At col. 12, lines 3-6, Fujita notes that a protective layer may be

formed on the periphery of the device to prevent the infiltration of water into the device. Nothing in Fujita describes or suggests a multi-film arrangement such as is recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, since both Sakaguchi and Fujita fail to describe or suggest a multi-film arrangement, no combination of the two could describe or suggest such an arrangement and the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims should be withdrawn.

Similarly to claim 1, independent claims 6 and 12 recite an arrangement in which a passivation film is formed over an absorption film, and independent claim 23 recites an arrangement in which a passivation film is formed over an inorganic hygroscopic film. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6, 12 and 23 and their dependent claims for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 18-22 and 42-49 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Tang in view of Fujita.

Independent claim 18 recites a light emitting device that includes a substrate, a TFT formed over the substrate, an EL element electrically connected with the TFT, and an absorption film formed over the EL element such that the EL element is interposed between the substrate and the absorption film. While Tang discloses TFTs and EL elements that are covered by a passivation layer, Tang does not describe or suggest an absorption layer. Moreover, nothing in Tang or Fujita would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to replace Tang's passivation layer with a protective layer formed from a material having water absorbing properties, as

of the rejection of claims 18-22.

Independent claim 42 recites, among other elements, a plurality of EL elements and a driver circuit over which is formed an inorganic hygroscopic film, with the EL elements being positioned in a space between two substrates that is hermetically sealed by a sealant. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 42-49 because neither Tang, Fujita, nor any combination of the two, describes or suggests EL elements and an inorganic hygroscopic film arranged between two substrates in a manner such as is recited in claim 42.

Applicant : Keiiti Ogura et al.
Serial No. : 09/966,740
Filed : October 1, 2001
Page : 14 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-077001 / US5246

Indeed, neither Tang, Fujita, nor any combination of the two, appears to describe or suggest using two substrates.


Claims 27-41 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Sakaguchi in view Fujita and Gytoku.

Similarly to claim 1, each of independent claims 27 and 33 recites a multi-layer arrangement in which an EL element is covered by a barrier film that is covered by an inorganic hygroscopic film that is covered by a passivation film. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Sakaguchi and Fujita fail to describe or suggest such a multi-layer arrangement. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Gytoku does not remedy this failure of Sakaguchi and Fujita. In particular, nothing in Sakaguchi, Fujita, or Gytoku would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Sakaguchi in the manner proposed.

Enclosed is a \$930 for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 22, 2003



John F. Hayden
Doc No. 27,640

1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40177164.doc